



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/593,987

10/11/2006

Jouni Korhonen

5420-10PUS

3403

27799

7590

08/03/2010

COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP  
551 FIFTH AVENUE  
SUITE 1210  
NEW YORK, NY 10176

EXAMINER

PHAM, TITO Q

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2466

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/03/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/593,987	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KORHONEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> TITO PHAM	<b>Art Unit</b> 2466	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 June 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                     |                                                                   |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)         | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____                                                         | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 22, 2010 has been entered.

Claims 12-21 are pending.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chin et al. (US Pat. No. 7,277,453) in view of Huitema (US Pat. No. 6,016,512) in view of Kim (US Pub. No. 2004/0218611).

Regarding **claims 12 and 15**, Chin discloses a method for determining a required access point for data transmission between a first operator network and at least a second operator network, the first operator network comprising a first name server and the second operator network comprising a second name server and the

Art Unit: 2466

required access point for receiving communication from at least the first operator network (figures 2 and 4, (col. 12 lines 62-67 to col. 13 lines 1-54), the method comprising:

    sending a query for a network address of a node in the second operator network, the query being directed to the first name server (col. 13 lines 12-15);

    transmitting the query from the first name server to the second name server of the second operator network (col. 13 lines 16-24), the second name server comprising network addresses of node of the second operator network (col. 12 lines 63-65);

    determining the network address of the required node in the second name server (col. 13 lines 25-33);

    after receiving the network address of the required access point from the second name server (col. 13 lines 33-35), transmitting, by the first name server, a query response including only the network address of the required node to a control element of the first operator network (col. 13 lines 33-37); and

    setting up a connection from the control element of the first operator network to the required access point of the second network on the basis of the network address of the required access point in the query response (col. 13 lines 62-67), the required access point of the second network routing messages originated from the first operator network to an intended network address in the second network (col. 13 lines 55-67).

Chin further teaches DNS server A communicates with DNS server B through DNS-ALG GW A and DNS-ALG GW B (col. 13 lines 16-24). Chin does not explicitly

Art Unit: 2466

teach DNS server of network A transmits a query to DNS server of network B. However, Huitema discloses a local server relays a DNS request to a root server after determining that the local server does not have a requested address (figure 1). Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement in Chin a step of DNS server relays a request to another DNS server. The motivation is to obtain an answer/response from a right server.

Chin further teaches the DNS response includes the gateway address (col. 10 lines 54-62; the IPv6 is the gateway address, the IPv4 is the private node address).

Chin does not teach in response to detecting a connection setup message from the first operator network to the second operator network, generating a DNS request, and return the gateway address. However, Kim discloses in response to detecting a connection setup message from the first operator network to the second operator network, generating a DNS request, and return the gateway address (paragraph 158). Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement in Chin in response to detecting a connection setup message from the first operator network to the second operator network, generating a DNS request, and return the gateway address. The motivation is to obtain a public destination address (gateway address) for communication between two private address nodes.

Regarding **claims 13 and 16**, all limitations in claims 12 and 15 are disclosed above. Chin further teaches wherein the second name server is a domain name server

Art Unit: 2466

comprising, in a centralized manner, the network addresses of other network elements of the second operator network (figure 4; col. 13 lines 25-33; col. 12 lines 62-65)

Regarding **claim 14**, all limitations in claim 12 are disclosed above. Chin further teaches maintaining, in said first name server, network address data of at least one second name server for each operator network, with which the first operator network is communicating (col. 13 lines 16-24).

4. Claim 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chin et al. (US Pat. No. 7,277,453) in view of Huitema (US Pat. No. 6,016,512) in view of Kim (US Pub. No. 2004/0218611) in view of Callas et al. (US Pub. No. 2004/0133775).

Regarding **claim 17**, all limitations in claim 15 are disclosed above. Chin does not teach said second name server is an LDAP database. However, Callas discloses an e-mail server contains an LDAP server (paragraph 83). Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement in Chin an LDAP database. The motivation is to have a database containing user profiles.

5. Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chin et al. (US Pat. No. 7,277,453) in view of Huitema (US Pat. No. 6,016,512) in view of Kim (US Pub. No. 2004/0218611) in view of Laurila (WO 2005/069,663).

Regarding **claim 18**, all limitations in claim 15 are disclosed above. Chin does not teach at least one of said first and second operator networks is an IMS data

Art Unit: 2466

transmission network and an interfacing network between the first and the second operator network is a GRX network. However, Laurila discloses an IMS interfaces an GPRS network (figure 1 elements 11 and 12). Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute the private IP network with an IMS network and a public IP network with a GPRS network to obtain a predictable result of network compatibility.

Regarding **claim 19**, Chin does not teach the required access point of said second network is an I-CSCF contact point. However, Laurila discloses the required access point of said second network is an I-CSCF contact point. Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement in Chin the required access point of said second network is an I-CSCF contact point. The motivation is to control call session.

6. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chin et al. (US Pat. No. 7,277,453) in view of Huitema (US Pat. No. 6,016,512) in view of Kim (US Pub. No. 2004/0218611).

Regarding **claim 20**, Chin discloses a name server storing names arranged in an operator network (figure 4), said name server comprising:

a private name server including a network address of a required access point of the operator network (col. 13 lines 25-33; col. 14 lines 28-42), the required access point being arranged to receive communication from another operator network comprising a control element implementing a call/session control function and managing

Art Unit: 2466

the routing of messages originated from the another operator network to an intended network address in the operator network (figure 2 gateways A and B),

wherein said private name server being is arranged to receive a query from a name server of the another operator network regarding a network address of the required access point of the operator network (col. 13 lines 15-24; col. 14 lines 37-43);

said private name server is arranged to determine, on the basis of the query, the network address of the required access point (col. 13 lines 25-33); and

said private name server is arranged to return only the network address of the required access point to the name server of the another operator network for transmission to the control element of the another operator network (col. 13 lines 25-33; col. 14 lines 35-43).

Chin further teaches the DNS response includes the gateway address (col. 10 lines 54-62; the IPv6 is the gateway address, the IPv4 is the private node address).

Chin does not teach querying and returning the gateway address. However, Kim teaches receives a gateway address query and returns the gateway address (paragraph 158). Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement in Chin in response to detecting a connection setup message from the first operator network to the second operator network, generating a DNS request, and return the gateway address. The motivation is to obtain a public destination address (gateway address) for communication between two private address nodes.



Chin further teaches DNS server A communicates with DNS server B through DNS-ALG GW A and DNS-ALG GW B (col. 13 lines 16-24). Chin does not explicitly teach DNS server of network A transmits a query to DNS server of network B. However, Huitema discloses a local server relays a DNS request to a root server after determining that the local server does not have a requested address (figure 1). Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement in Chin a step of DNS server relays a request to another DNS server. The motivation is to obtain an answer/response from a right server.

7. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chin et al. (US Pat. No. 7,277,453) in view of Huitema (US Pat. No. 6,016,512) in view of Kim (US Pub. No. 2004/0218611) in view of Callas et al. (US Pub. No. 2004/0133775).

Regarding **claim 21**, all limitations in claim 20 are disclosed above. Chin does not teach said second name server is an LDAP database. However, Callas discloses an e-mail server contains an LDAP server (paragraph 83). Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement in Chin an LDAP database. The motivation is to have a database containing user profiles.

### ***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 12-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TITO PHAM whose telephone number is (571) 272-4122. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8AM-5PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel Ryman can be reached on 571-272-3152. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tito Pham/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2466

/Daniel J. Ryman/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2466